



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,225	12/23/2005	David Hildebrand	47100-222154	9451
26694	7590	03/27/2008		
VENABLE LLP				
P.O. BOX 34385				
WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998				
EXAMINER				
KRUSE, DAVID H				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1638				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/27/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/562,225

**Applicant(s)**

HILDEBRAND ET AL.

**Examiner**

David H. Kruse

**Art Unit**

1638

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 January 2008.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-43 and 48-64 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 44-46 is/are rejected.  
7) ☒ Claim(s) 47 is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/23/05.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election of Group II, claims 44-47, in the reply filed on 11 January 2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 1-43 and 48-64 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR § 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 11 January 2008.
3. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR § 1.17(i).

### ***Drawings***

4. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.121(d) are required in this application because Figures 2a, 2b, 2d, 5 and 7 appear to be scanned photographs which do not show enough detail to determine what is represented as related to the invention. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer

Art Unit: 1638

prepares new drawings. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

5. The listing of references on pages 27-29 of the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR § 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.
6. The IDS filed 23 December 2005 has been considered, a signed copy is attached hereto.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vorst *et al* (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0061633 A1, filed 15 October 2002 (371(c) date)) in view of Falco *et al* (U.S. Patent 5,773,691), Maughan *et al* 1999, In Vitro Cell. Dev. Biol. - Plant, 35: 344-349 and Silk *et al* 1997, Plant Molecular Biology 33: 931-933.

Vorst teaches a method of selecting a transformed host cell comprising a recombinant nucleic acid encoding a DHPS enzyme by culturing said host cell in the

Art Unit: 1638

presence of 2-AEC at claim 14. Vorst teaches that Falco *et al* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,773,691) had transformed soybean with a feedback-insensitive bacterial DHPS enzyme (dapA gene) at page 2, left column, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph. Vorst teaches that Silk 1997 mutated a soybean DHPS enzyme encoding polypeptide to encode a lysine-insensitive DHPS enzyme at page 2, right column, paragraph 0013. Vorst *et al* teaches using a polynucleotide encoding a potato lysine insensitive DHSP enzyme (see pages 4 and 5).

Vorst does not teach transforming soybean somatic embryogenic cultures.

Falco *et al* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,773,691) teach a transforming soybean with a feedback-insensitive bacterial DHPS enzyme (dapA gene) at columns 66-69, Example 19.

Maughan teaches generating transgenic soybean plant by introducing a polynucleotide into a soybean somatic embryogenic culture (see page 345, left column).

Silk teaches mutating a soybean DHPS enzyme encoding polypeptide to encode a lysine-insensitive DHPS enzyme. Silk teaches that plant lysine-insensitive DHPS enzymes can be used for selection using AEC (page 931, left column, last paragraph).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to modify the teachings of Vorst *et al* to generate a herbicide-resistant transgenic soybean plant using the method of Maughan *et al* by introducing into a soybean somatic embryogenic culture a polynucleotide encoding a functional DHPS polypeptide resistant to 2-AEC and selecting using an effective amount of 2-AEC. It would have also been obvious to modify the teachings of Vorst *et al* to use the soybean *DapA* mutants encoding lysine-insensitive DHPS enzymes as taught by

Art Unit: 1638

Silk *et al.* In addition, Falco *et al* teaches that soybean can be transformed with a bacterial lysine-insensitive DHPS enzyme, and that said enzyme will function with a reasonable expectation of success.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claim 47 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art does not anticipate or render obvious a method of using Applicants' SEQ ID NO: 1.

***Conclusion***

10. Claims 44-46 are rejected, and claims 47 is objected to.
11. No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1638

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David H. Kruse, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0799. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anne Marie Grunberg can be reached at (571) 272-0975. The central FAX number for official correspondence is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

/David H Kruse/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1638  
19 March 2008

13. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.